

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	. FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,779	04/30/2001	George Jackowski	2132.038 4601	
21917	7590 09/16/2003			
MCHALE & SLAVIN, P.A.			EXAMINER	
2855 PGA BLVD PALM BEACH GARDENS, FL 33410			AUDET, MAURY A	
FALM BEA	CH GARDENS, FL 33410	•	· et.	
	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1654 DATE MAILED: 09/16/2003	11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>						
΄,	Application No. Applicant(s)					
	09/846,779	JACKOWSKI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Maury Audet	1654				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 A		•				
· /—	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 36-43</u> is/are pending in the app	lication.	,				
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>36-43</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priorapplication from the International Bur* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	· ·				
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language prov 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	• •					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7.	5) Notice of Informal (y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				
S. Patent and Trademark Office						

Art Unit: 1654

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.142, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. Claim 1, drawn to a biopolymer marker peptide consisting of amino acid residues
 2-14 of SEQ ID NO: 1, classified in class 530, subclass 300.
- II. Claims 36-40, drawn to a method for diagnosing myocardial infarction comprising obtaining, conducting, and comparing a sample from a patient (3 steps), classified in class 424, subclass 9.34.
- III. Claims 41-43, drawn to a myocardial infarction diagnostic assay kit comprising a peptide of SEQ ID NO: 1 and an antibody that binds said peptide, classified in class 514, subclass 2; class 530, subclass 387.1

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the process (myocardial infarction diagnosis) for using the

Art Unit: 1654

product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, such as imagining techniques (i.e. MRI, Stress Echocardiography, and Nuclear techniques).

Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case Invention I does not use an antibody, as in Invention III; therefore the two are different inventions.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case Invention II does not use an antibody, as in Invention III; therefore the two are different inventions.

During a telephone conversation with Ferris Lander on August 12, 2003, and via Preliminary Amendment on August 13, 2003, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claim 1. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 36-43 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Specification

The amendment filed August 13, 2003 (Paper No. 10) is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: a sequence listing of 14 residues, rather than the 13 residue peptide found in the original specification (see originally filed claim 1, and the 13 residue peptide sequence listing filed April 19, 2002 (Paper No. 9).

Art Unit: 1654

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Namely, amendment of claim 1 to include the new SEQ ID NO: 1 (which is a 14 residue peptide), even though not expressly claimed (since residues 2-14 is claimed as the invention); nevertheless claims new matter, since the originally filed claim 1 only contained reference to a 13 residue peptide. Applicant must amend the claims or indicate where support for the amendment may be found in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Art Unit: 1654

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by WO 01/21188 A1 (The Government of the United States of America, as represented by The Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services). [Note: Wang et al. below is the US National Phase of WO 01/21188 A1].

WO 01/21188 A1 (like Wang et al. below) teach SEQ ID NO: 1 residues 2-14 at page 71, SEQ ID NO: 292.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fukishima et al (JP 09121888 A).

Fukishima et al. teach SEQ ID NO: 1 residues 2-14 at page 10, SEQ ID NO: 10.

Art Unit: 1654

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al. (US 2003/0120037 A1)

Wang et al. (like WO 01/21188 A1) teach SEQ ID NO: 1 residues 2-14 at page 108, SEQ ID NO: 292.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maury Audet whose telephone number is 703-305-5039. The examiner can normally be reached from 7:00~AM-5:30~PM, off Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached at 703-306-3220. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communications and 703-308-1234 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.

MA

August 19, 2003

MICHAEL MELLER PRIMARY EXAMINER